DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 277 673 SP 028 422

AUTHOR Young, Michael; And Others
TITLE Teacher Training Workshops in Drug Education: Correlates of Curriculum Implementation.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 13p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Drug Education; Elementary Education; Health Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Teacher Workshops; Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Curriculum IMplementation

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine: (1) the impact of teacher training workshops in elementary school drug education on actual implementation of drug education programs; and (2) whether a set of variables could be identified which distinguished between workshop participants who implemented a majority of workshop activites in their classrooms and those who did not. Teachers attended 5-day workshops where they received content information about drugs, as well as activities and materials for use in helping students to learn about drugs and to develop self-esteem and decision-making skills. Subsequently the teachers responded to a masked questionnaire designed to elicit information on whether or not they had implemented the program on drug education in their classrooms. Responses indicated that a group of 105 subjects implemented the curriculum, while 86 did so in a limited way only or not at all. Four variables were identified that made a significant contribution to predicting in which group a teacher would belong. The variables were: perception of parental interest, perceived freedom in deciding what to teach, perception of the value of continuing education activities, and sex of the respondent. A copy of the questionnaire is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED277673

Teacher Training Workshops In Drug Education: Correlates Of Curriculum Implementation

Michael Young, Ph.D
University of Arkansas
Program in Health Sciences

Charlotte Hendricks, H.S.D.
University of Alabama - Birmingham
Dept. Health Education, Physical
Health Education & Recreation

Betty Hubbard, Ed.D.
University of Central Arkansas
Dept. of Health Education

SP 028 427

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Young

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TEACHER TRAINING WORKSHOPS IN DRUG EDUCATION: CORRELATES OF CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

In addition to providing direct educational services, health educators often have the opportunity to indirectly affect the health of school age children by serving as teacher trainers. Training others to implement health education programs brings about a multiplyer effect. Thus the individual health educator has a potential to reach far greater numbers of children than he or she could ever reach alone.

Many teachers who are expected to provide health education experiences for their students may benefit from workshops or other types of additional training that health educators can provide. This is especially true at the elementary school level. Elementary teachers generally have little, if any, formal training in health education content areas. Yet, if elementary children are to receive health instruction, it will almost always be provided by their regular classroom teacher.

Training of teachers is important. However, such training is not of real benefit unless programs are implemented as a result of training. This study assessed the impact of a workshop training program on the classroom implementation of drug education programs.

The purpose of the study was to determine: (1) the impact of teacher training workshops in elementary school drug education on actual implementation of drug education programs and (2) whether a set of variables could be identified which

distinguished between workshop participants who implemented a majority of workshop activities in their classrooms and participants who did not implement activities.

Each year since 1981, the health education departments at the University of Central Arkansas, at Conway, and the University of Arkansas, at Fayetteville, have shared a contract from the Arkansas Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention to provide summer workshop training for elementary school teachers. Teachers attended the workshop at either Conway or Fayetteville as part of a school team. Usually three or four teachers per school were represented. Workshops were five days in length totalling approximately 30 hours of classroom instruction. Teachers received content information about drugs, as well as activities and materials for use in leading students to learn about drugs and to develop self-esteem and decision making skills. Upon completion of the workshop, teachers were to return to their respective schools to implement drug education programs in their classrooms.

In order to determine the number of workshop participants actually implementing drug eduation programs in their classrooms, the number of children affected by such programs, and factors which seemed to influence program implementation, a survey of past workshop participants was conducted. To disguise the intent of the study, questionnaires were mailed from a bogus educational research institute in another state. The cover letter indicated that the questionnaire was part of a continuing education survey

regarding workshop and classroom implementation of activities in the areas of classroom management, basic skills, and drug education. We felt that workshop participants would be more likely to respond to the questionnaire in an unbiased manner if the study appeared to be a general questionnaire conducted by an independent institution that was not connected with either of the two universities responsible for the training. In addition to demographic data, the questionnaire included items which were designed to assess educational professionalism and elicit information concerning the respondents perception of factors which may have been helpful in the implementation of workshop activities. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix A. The questionnaires were sent to 324 workshop participants. A second mailing was sent to non-respondents. A total of 195 questionnaires were returned for a 60.18 percent return rate.

Respondents were grouped into one of four categories based upon their reported implementation of drug education workshop activities: (1) never implemented workshop activities, (2) had implemented activities in the past, but no longer, (3) continued to implement a few of the activities, (4) continued to implement a majority of the activities. Because only a few respondents were placed in the first two groups, respondents in groups 1-3 were considered as a single group. Respondents in group four comprised a second group. Thus the groups were identified as (1) teachers who were "curriculum implementers" and (2) teachers who were "limited or non-implementers." In order to identify variables which might distinguish between these two groups of

respondents, data were analyzed by Harrell's (undated) logistical regression procedure Proc Logist, utilizing the stepwise option.

Results indicated that 7 respondents had never implemented activities from the drug education workshop, 13 had implemented activities in the past, but were not currently doing so, 66 continued to implement a few of the activities and 105 continued to implement a majority of the activities. This gave 105 subjects in the "curriculum implementors" group and 86 subjects in the group of non or limited implementors

Distinguishing "curriculum implementors" from "non-implementors" by identifying a set of discriminating variables was accomplished through the use of logistical regression. Discriminant analysis is the statistical test often used in such situations. According to Press and Wilson (1978), however, logistical regression is a more appropriate technique when multivariate normality is not present. Truett, Cornfield and Kannel (1967) emphasize that in most applications it is unlikely that multivariate normality can be assummed. Hence, logistical regression was deemed to be the appropriate statistical technique for this study.

Proc Logist is a logistical regression procedure developed by Frank E. Harrell who is in clinical biostatistics at Duke University Medical Center. The procedure was run using the SAS statistical package.

INSERT TABLE 1

ABOUT HERE

The logistical regression identified four variables which, as a set, made a significant contribution to the prediction of group membership. The variables, in order of selection, were: perception of parental interest, perceived freedom in deciding what to teach, perception of the value of continuing education activities, and sex of the respondent. The reclassification rate was 66.7 percent. Respondents also indicated that as a result of the workshop experience, their work in drug education had directly affected, 15,700 students.

The results of this study indicate that large numbers of school age children can be reached in drug education programs by providing a training program geared for elementary school teachers. Additionally, this study identified a set of variables which was found to be important in predicting the degree of program implementation. It may be that these same varialbes are also important in predicting implementation of other types of health education programs.

REFERENCES

Harrell, F.E. Logist Procedure, documentation of procedure is an undated mimeographed manuscript. Duke University Medical Center, Durham, N.C.

Press, S.J. and Wilson, S. Choosing between logistic regression and discriminant analysis. Journal of the American Statistical Association 1978, 73:699-705

Truett, J., Cornfield, J., and Kannel, W. A multivariate analysis of the risk of coronary heart disease in Framingham. Journal of Chronic Disease, 1967, 20:511-524.

TABLE 1

LOGISTICAL REGRESSION

FINAL PARAMETER ESTIMATES

VARIABLE	BETA	STD. ERROR	CHI-SQ	P	R
Intercept	0.3503	1.4476	0.06	0.809	
Freedom	0.9056	0.2501	13.11	0.000	2.21
Parent Interest	0.5177	0.1974	9.79	0.002	0.17
Continuing Education	0.9174	0.3358	7.46	0.005	0.15
Sex	1.6363	0.7599	4.64	0.031	0.10

RECLASSIFICATION RATE 66.7%

10

9

Appendix A

CONTINUING EDUCATION SURVEY

Please respond to the following items by placing the number of your response in the blank provided for each item.

_____ 1. I am a: (1) male
(2) female

_____ 2. My position in my school is:
(1) teacher
(2) school nurse
(3) counselor
(4) principal or superintendent
(5) supervisor or coordinator
(6) other (please specify_____)

_____ 3. What is your total years experience in this type of position? (Record actual number of years including this year.)

_____ 4. If you are not currently in a teaching position, how many years teaching experience do you have? (Record actual number of years.)

_____ 5. If you are not currently in a teaching position, how long has it been since you held a teaching position? (Record actual number of years including this year.)

_____ 6. My school district is:
(1) small (less than 1,000 students)
(2) medium (1,000 - 5,000 students)
(3) large (over 5,000 students)

_____ 7. I live in the same community in which I teach.
(1) yes (2) no

_____ 8. During the last 5 years, I have attended a workshop in classroom management techniques.
(1) yes (2) no

If yes, continue with item 9. If no, proceed to item 13.

_____ 9. What year did you attend this workshop?
(1) 1984 (2) 1983 (3) 1982 (4) 1981 (5) 1980

_____10. I have implemented the workshop ideas and activities to the following extent:
(If you are a teacher or counselor, indicate the extent to which you have implemented these ideas in classroom situations. If you are in a non-teaching position, indicate the extent to which you have seen these ideas implemented in your school.)
(1) I have never implemented anything from the workshop.
(2) I have implemented activities in the past, but no longer use them.
(3) I am incorporating a few of the activities and materials
(4) I am incorporating the majority of the activities and materials.

_____11. My efforts have directly affected _____ students. (Record actual number of students.)

_____12. I have helped other teachers implement these activities in their classrooms.

(1) yes (2) no

_____13. During the last 5 years, I have attended a teacher training workshop in a basic skills area (reading, math, etc.).

(1) yes (2) no

If yes, continue with item 14. If no, proceed to item 18.

_____14. What year did you attend this workshop?

(1) 1984 (2) 1983 (3) 1982 (4) 1981 (5) 1980

_____15. I have implemented the workshop ideas and activities to the following extent:

(If you are a teacher or counselor, indicate the extent to which you have implemented these ideas in classroom situations. If you are in a non-teaching position, indicate the extent to which you have seen these ideas implemented in your school.)

(1) I have never implemented anything from the workshop.
(2) I have implemented activities in the past, but no longer use them.
(3) I am incorporating a few of the activities and materials.
(4) I am incorporating the majority of the activities and materials.

_____16. My efforts have directly affected _____ students. (Record actual number of students.)

_____17. I have helped other teachers implement these activities in their classrooms.

(1) yes (2) no

_____18. During the last 5 years, I have attended a teacher training workshop in drug education.

(1) yes (2) no

If yes, continue with item 19. If no, proceed to item 23.

_____19. What year did you attend the workshop?

(1) 1984 (2) 1983 (3) 1982 (4) 1981 (5) 1980

_____20. I have implemented the workshop ideas and activities to the following extent:

(If you are a teacher or counselor, indicate the extent to which you have implemented these ideas in classroom situations. If you are in a non-teaching position, indicate the extent to which you have seen these ideas implemented in your school.)

(1) I have never implemented anything from the workshop.
(2) I have implemented activities in the past, but no longer use them.
(3) I am incorporating a few of the activities and materials.
(4) I am incorporating the majority of the activities and materials.

_____21. My efforts have directly affected _____ students. (Record actual number of students.)

_____22. I have helped other teachers implement these activities in their classrooms.

(1) yes (2) no

23. Please indicate the extent to which the following factors have been helpful to you in implementing the ideas you learned through workshop participation.

Rate according to: 1 - very helpful 2 - helpful 3 - not a factor
4 - unhelpful 5 - very unhelpful

_____a. administrative support

_____b. accessibility of materials

_____c. personal interest

_____d. quality of workshop training

_____e. follow-up by workshop trainers

_____f. interest of parents

_____g. interest of students

24. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Rate according to: 1 - strongly agree 2 - agree
3 - disagree 4 - strongly disagree

_____a. I feel that my participation in workshops, professional associations, and continuing education activities has little personal or professional value.

_____b. I feel that what I do in the classroom can make a difference in the lives of children.

_____c. I feel unsure of my ability to take new concepts and make them applicable to students.

_____d. I am eager to try new ideas and activities in the classroom.

_____e. I have freedom to decide what students are taught.